DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 266 FL 007 650

AUTHOR LoCoco, Veronica Gonzalez-Mena
TITLE An Analysis of Spanish and German Learners' Errors. Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 7.
INSTITUTION Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto. Bilingual Education Project.
PUB DATE Sep 75
NOTE 30p.; For related documents, see FL 007 646-651

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adult Learning; Adult Students; *Error Patterns; *German; *Interference (Language Learning); Language Instruction; Learning Processes; *Second Language Learning; *Spanish; Transfer of Training; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Error Analysis

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes Spanish and German errors committed by adult native speakers of English enrolled in elementary and intermediate levels. Four written samples were collected for each target language, over a period of five months. Errors were categorized according to their possible source. Types of errors were ordered according to their frequency. The hierarchies of relative difficulty thus obtained varied for the target languages. The production of some errors seemed to be based on proposed universals of language acquisition, other errors appeared to be directly related to the languages involved. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125266

An Analysis of Spanish and German Learners' Errors

Veronica Gonzalez-Mena LoCoco
University of Santa Clara

Abstract

This study analyzes Spanish and German errors committed by adult native speakers of English enrolled in elementary and intermediate levels. Four written samples were collected for each target language, over a period of five months. Errors were categorized according to their possible source. Types of errors were ordered according to their frequency. The hierarchies of relative difficulty thus obtained varied for the target languages. The production of some errors seemed to be based on proposed universals of language acquisition; other errors appeared to be directly related to the languages involved.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
OISE, Bilingual Education Project
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

FL007650

An Analysis of Spanish and German Learners' Errors

Introduction

The increased interest in L2 research has raised several questions as yet unanswered: Are the results obtained for one target language applicable to another one? What influence does age have on the learner's errors? How similar are first and second language acquisition? Under what conditions are they similar? Are there second language universal strategies?

Obviously no one study can provide the answers. However, any information obtained from an investigation is a building stone for the mass of evidence needed to respond to these questions. The present study is intended to provide information on L2 acquisition relevant primarily to the questions: Are the results obtained for one target language applicable to another one? Are first language acquisition universal strategies applicable to second language acquisition?

Subjects

The subjects were students at the University of Santa Clara enrolled in the first and second levels of Spanish or of German. The university operates under the quarter system; the first level is taught in the Fall, the second one in Winter. Since two quarters were involved, enrollment differed in each level. Due to absences or students dropping class, the number of students who participated was not constant from sample to sample. Four samples were collected, two in Fall, two in Winter. The

number of students for each was the following:

Spanish		German	
Sample 1	- 48	Sample 1	- 44
Sample 2	- 44	Sample 2	- 39
Sample 3	- 42	Sample 3	- 35
Sample 4	- 42	Sample 4	- 28

All students were native speakers of English. Bilinguals were excluded.

Collection of data

Approximately three weeks after the beginning of each quarter, and one month after that date, students were assigned a composition, the topic being of their own choice. It was stressed that no grade would be given, that they should not fear making mistakes, and that the compositions were intended to let the instructor know the students' area of difficulty so that he/she could provide the needed assistance. The suggested length was one handwritten page. The first composition seldom reached that length since the students' knowledge was very limited at that time. The third and fourth compositions tended to be longer, one and a half to two pages.

Analysis of Samples

Each error that occurred was assigned to a source category. The following criteria were used in the categorization of errors:
Errors were labelled interlingual errors when L1 has a rule which L2 does not have and the L1 rule is applied to L2, for example,

L1 rule:

The present progressive tense may be used to express futurity.

L2:

Does not have this rule.

Learner's language:

Está cantando mañana. (He is singing tomorrow.)

Intralingual errors occur when L1 does not have a rule which L2 has; the learner applies an L2 rule which produces an error. An example is:

L1:

No adjective and noun agreement rule.

L2 rule:

Adjectives and nouns have to agree in gender and number.

Learner's language:

ninos buena; grosse Häuser

Dual errors are evidenced when L1 does not have a rule which L2 has, and no rule is applied in L2. These errors reflect a simplification which is modelled after the mother tongue. For instance,

L1:

No rule.

L2 rule:

When the direct object is a person, the object marker a is required.

Learner's language:

Veo María (I see Mary)

Lack of transfer errors take place when L1 and L2 have the same rule, and the rule is not applied in L2; or when both languages do not have a rule which the learner applies in L2. That is, the structures of L1

and L2 are parallel, but an error is committed.

For example,

L1 rule:

The perfect tenses require an auxiliary verb,

L2 rule:

Same as L1.

Learner's language:

El visto; er gesehen (he seen)

Errors were termed communicative when the learner attempted to use a structure or word form whose lexical, semantic and functional characteristics had not been taught in the classroom. For example, the use by the learner of a verb in the indicative mood where the subjunctive would be required, at a time when the rule for the use of the subjunctive mood in the particular structure had not been taught. Errors were also labelled communicative when the form and its usage had been taught, but the error, as related to the total information on the learner's errors, clearly indicated that the learner had no knowledge of its form.

It was not always possible to classify errors as belonging to one category or another, which made it necessary to include a category of overlap errors which are those which could derive from two or more sources.

To test the reliability of the classification, another language instructor and the investigator categorized eighty errors. Ninety percent agreement would be needed to ascertain the categorization as being reliable. Actual agreement was 93.7%.

Analysis of Data

The data obtained from the categorization of errors were divided

into two groups. One group pertained to the entire sample, the other one to the 18 Spanish students and the 16 German students for whom four samples were available.

For the entire sample the percentage of errors in each category was calculated. Based on these results, errors were ranged in decreasing frequency. This provided a hierarchy of errors according to their source. The hierarchy which was established was not constant from month to month nor was it the same for both target languages. Errors appeared to be influenced by the opportunity to commit the error, by the input, by the language under consideration and by the learner's knowledge at the time the samples were collected.

In German there was less variability than in Spanish. In the former, the first three places were occupied by the error types: intralingual, interlingual and lack of transfer; in that order. The other types varied slightly. In Spanish, only intralingual errors were constant. They always occupied the first place.

Almost all intralingual errors were morphological. In both languages, the greatest proportion of intralingual errors occurred in the grammatical category of adjectives, the verb category was second. The morphology of the languages is such that adjectival changes are required depending on the case and/or noun being used. In a language in which such changes are not necessary, for example English, a different pattern would probably be evidenced.

While interlingual errors were always second in German, they were fifth, third, fourth and second in Spanish. The high incidence of interlingual errors in German was due to word order errors, the learners

used the English word order. This finding agrees with Dušková (1969) and Powell's (1975) who found that mother-tongue interference in their subjects was evidenced in word order. Dušková's subjects were Czechs learning English; Powell's were Americans learning French. Word order errors in Spanish also presented mother-tongue interference; however, they were not as numerous. They pertained primarily to adjective position. Adjectives in Spanish follow the noun in most cases, whereas in English they precede it. Word order errors in German always involved a verb and pertained primarily to declarative sentences. In English, simple declarative sentences follow the pattern SVO (subject-verb-object). Speakers of English associate the position of the verb with that of the subject. However, in German the verb does not depend on the subject for its position; the finite verb is always the second element in simple declarative sentences. The first element can be the subject or another element, for example, an adverb, an object or a predicate adjective. In dependent clauses the English verb position does not differ from that of declarative sentences but in German it is necessary that the tense carrier of the dependent clause occupy the last position. There is an obvious difference between English and German verb position rules. These rules in German are also more complex than the Spanish adjective position rules; a fact which probably accounts for the difference in word order error frequencies.

The increase in interlingual errors in the Spanish sample 4 was due to whole expression terms. This term was used for cases in which a whole phrase or sentence used words and a pattern which did not correspond

to the target language. In most cases the resulting expressions could be related directly to the mother-tongue; they were word for word translations of an L1 structure. These errors emerged in sample 2, doubled in sample 3 and continued increasing in sample 4.

Lack of transfer errors, which ranked third in German, ranked low in Spanish (except for sample 1). Their order in Spanish was 1, 4, 6, 4. The majority of these errors involved verbs in German and adjectives in Spanish. In German, the most frequent errors were the use of a conjugated verb where the infinitive would be required; and the use of the past tense for the present tense. The first type of error occurred primarily after modals, for example: Er will lernt (he wants learns), sie kann geht (she can goes). The use of the past tense for the present tense might have been a case of retroactive inhibition. This type of error was most frequent in sample 2, which was taken shortly after the introduction of the past tenses. Although still present in later samples, its incidence decreased.

In Spanish, lack of transfer errors dealt primarily with article usage. The article was used where neither English nor Spanish would require it; or it was omitted where both languages require it. Examples are: Nací en la San Francisco (I was born in the San Francisco); Viven en casa muy pequeña (They live in small house). Article usage in Spanish, as compared to English differs not only in frequency but an article's required presence seems often unpredictable for the English speaker. In some cases English does not require an article and Spanish does; in others, Spanish does not require it either. For

example:

Mrs. Smith is friendly - La señora Smith . . .

Mrs. Smith, please come! - Señora Smith . . .

The children are not home - Los niños . . .

Children are careless - Los niños . . .

This seems to result in a confusion which is probably responsible for the lack of transfer errors. Other errors, although less frequent, were verb omissions: Yo estudiante (I student). Errors such as the ones that took place in German, also occurred: El quiere come (He wants eats).

Dual errors ranked high in Spanish in every sample: 3, 2, 3, 2. In German, on the other hand, they occupied the last place in three out of four samples. In sample 1 they were in penultimate place. As mentioned earlier, these errors represent a simplification of the target language which was modelled after the mother-tongue. In Spanish, they were omissions of conjunctions and prepositions which are not required in English. In these instances, the corresponding German structures were parallel to the English ones, and no such errors occurred in German. For example, Spanish veo a Juan, was rendered as veo Juan. The corresponding English and German sentences do not require a preposition: I see John, Iche sehe Hans.

Communicative errors ranked higher in Spanish than in German. These errors were made when students attempted to use a form which had not been taught. Spanish students appear to have been more "daring" in their use of the language, while German students seemed more cautious in their use of unknown forms possibly to avoid making mistakes. The instructors' attitude toward errors may have played a role.

Some of these errors dealt with morphological or phonological confusion. In Spanish, romantía was used for romántico (romantic), surpiente for serpiente (serpent). In German, blondine was used for blonde (blonde). Other errors dealt with lexical items which were expected to be symmetrical between the mother-tongue and the target language. For example, estación, which means season of the year in Spanish, was used to mean season of an event: baseball season, opera season. A different lexical item is required here: temporada. The student, however, had not been exposed to it. Students also attempted to use the present progressive tense before being taught its form. The result was the use of two conjugated verbs, instead of a conjugated verb and the present participle. That is, the learners used a known verb form for the not yet known participle: estoy entiendo, ich bin verstehe (I am (I) understand). This was the most frequent German communicative error.

Further examples of errors in each category are presented in the appendix.

The percentages of errors and the established hierarchies for each sample are presented in tables 1 and 2. The means of errors for each sample are presented in table 3. From the means it can be seen that for most categories the incidence of errors was rather low. The range and median provide an idea of the distribution of errors. These were obtained for the students for whom four samples were available. The range and median pertain to all the errors that were committed in a category from sample 1 through sample 4. They are shown in table 4.

TABLE 1

Percentages of error types

Type of error	Spanish %	German %
Sample 1		
Lack of transfer	10.7	9.4
Intralingual	31.9	58.6
Interlingual	11.5	23.0
Communicative	12.8	2.6
Dual	13.9	3.1
Overlap	11.1	3.1
Sample 2		
Lack of transfer	8.1	12.0
Intralingual	40.3	58.6
Interlingual	14.7	12.4
Communicative	15.2	5.5
Dual	15.2	3.3
Overlap	6.3	8.1
Sample 3		
Lack of transfer	5.0	6.9
Intralingual	44.2	61.2
Interlingual	11.7	18.6
Communicative	18.6	3.5
Dual	14.3	3.5
Overlap	6.1	6.3

TABLE 1 cont'd.

Percentages of error types

Sample 4

Type of error	Spanish %	German %
Lack of transfer	9.7	9.2
Intralingual	41.8	55.9
Interlingual	14.9	16.4
Communicative	10.8	9.2
Dual	14.9	4.6
Overlap	7.9	4.6

TABLE 2

Hierarchies of error types

Sample 1

Spanish	German
Intralingual	Intralingual
Lack of transfer	Interlingual
Dual	Lack of transfer
Communicative	Dual/Overlap
Interlingual	
Overlap	Communicative

Sample 2

Intralingual	Intralingual
Communicative/Dual	Interlingual
	Lack of transfer
Interlingual	Overlap
Lack of transfer	Communicative
Overlap	Dual

Sample 3

Intralingual	Intralingual
Communicative	Interlingual
Dual	Lack of transfer
Interlingual	Overlap
Overlap	Communicative/Dual
Lack of transfer	

TABLE 2 cont'd.

Hierarchies of error types

Sample 4

Spanish	German
Intralingual	Intralingual
Interlingual/Dual	Interlingual
	Communicative/Lack of transfer
Lack of transfer	
Overlap	Dual/Overlap

TABLE 3

Means of errors

Type of error	Spanish samples			
	1	2	3	4
Lack of transfer	1.12	.72	.59	1.19
Intralingual	1.92	3.61	5.21	5.15
Interlingual	.68	1.32	1.38	1.83
Communicative	.77	1.36	2.19	1.33
Dual	1.77	1.32	1.69	1.83
Overlap	.66	.57	.71	.97
	German samples			
Lack of transfer	.4	.92	.89	1.45
Intralingual	2.49	4.5	7.83	8.79
Interlingual	.98	.95	2.39	2.59
Communicative	.11	.42	.44	1.45
Dual	.13	.25	.44	.72
Overlap	.13	.62	.81	.72

TABLE 4

Ranges and medians of errors

Spanish

Type of error	Range	Median
Lack of transfer	0 to 7 (7)	3.5
Intralingual	3 to 31 (28)	15
Interlingual	1 to 8 (7)	5
Communicative	1 to 13 (12)	5
Dual	2 to 18 (16)	6
Overlap	1 to 8 (7)	3

German

Lack of transfer	1 to 5 (4)	2.5
Intralingual	9 to 35 (26)	22.5
Interlingual	1 to 21 (20)	4
Communicative	0 to 7 (7)	1
Dual	0 to 4 (4)	1
Overlap	0 to 5 (5)	1.5

Major differences between the languages were in the ranges of interlingual, communicative and dual errors; and in the median of intralingual errors. In the case of interlingual errors, although the range differences are considerable (7 in Spanish versus 20 in German) there is not much difference in the medians: 5 in Spanish versus 4 in German. The upper quartile of the German distribution was 11; therefore, only 25% of the students were responsible for the high values.

The low incidence of communicative errors in German has been discussed earlier. This is clearly indicated by the fact that the upper quartile was only 2. That is, a total of from 3 to 7 errors for all four samples, were committed by only 25% of the students. The pattern of dual errors is similar. The upper quartile was also 2. At the investigated levels of language learning, the opportunity to make a dual error is apparently not as frequent in German as it is in Spanish.

In the case of intralingual errors, the German scores were more evenly distributed than the Spanish ones. The German upper quartile was 26.5; the Spanish one was 20. Spanish scores scattered primarily at the lower end of the scale.

Errors were further analyzed to determine which L2 errors can be related to proposed first language acquisition universals. (For a detailed description of all errors, see LoCoco, 1975.) If certain L1 and L2 errors can be accounted for by the same operating principles, particular similarities between L1 and L2 acquisition may be postulated.

Universals have been proposed primarily by Slobin, (1971). A large number of them deal with order of acquisition, and consequently cannot be applied to language acquisition in a classroom situation where the order of acquisition is largely dependent on the input. However, when a second language is acquired in a natural setting, or in an immersion program such universals might be applicable. Universals and operating principles which appear to be responsible for errors found in this study are the following:

Universal D4: The greater the separation between related parts of a sentence, the greater the tendency that the sentence will not be adequately processed. German students tended to omit separable prefixes. Prefixes are frequently completely separated from their verb, they usually stand at the end of the sentence. Prefixes were most frequently omitted in long sentences.

Universal E4: When a child first controls a full form which can be contracted or deleted, contraction and deletion are avoided. Spanish learners seemed to follow the same universal when they failed to contract a + el and de + el.

Universal F1 describes the stages of linguistic marking of a semantic notion. One of the stages is overgeneralization of marking. In this study such generalization was observed in the German sample 3 in which the use of the subjunctive mood was clearly overgeneralized.

Operating principle G: The use of grammatical markers should make semantic sense. In German, as well as in Spanish, gender confusion was a common error. Gender is most often assigned arbitrarily; the learner has no semantic clue to aid him in the proper choice.

Universal G2: Errors in choice of functor are always within the given functor class and subcategory. In Spanish and in German, preposition confusion was frequent. Prepositions were substituted for other prepositions and not for elements of other grammatical classes.

Conclusions

The fact that a number of errors found in this study follow a pattern which can be explained by Slobin's (1971) proposed universals of first language acquisition suggests that first and second language acquisition does present similarities in the strategies employed by the learners. That certain errors cannot be accounted for by these universals appears to indicate the error dependency on particular languages, and on the learning situation. Slobin's universals were postulated in view of the first language acquisition situation where the child attempts to discover all of the language's rules. In the case of second language learning in the classroom a large number of rules are provided for the learner. He will most likely follow the same process of discovery that the first language learner does, only when a rule is not known or not understood. The provision of rules in classroom language learning appears to reduce the number of certain errors which occur in first language acquisition and are due to the child's hypothesizing. It also has to be kept in mind that the monolingual child, as he acquires his language, only has one system from which to infer hypotheses about the language. The second language learner on the other hand, draws his conclusions from the knowledge he has acquired about the target language, as well as from the mother-tongue system. This results in some errors which appear to contradict a universal strategy since these strategies are based on the

learner's experience with only one language. One such case is the word order error in German which seems to violate Operating Principle C: Pay attention to the order of words and morphemes. The learner does pay attention to word order, however, it is to the word order of the mother-tongue. The learner clearly formulates hypotheses which are based on all previous language experience.

The results of this study also show that it is not possible to formulate generalizations about the frequency of types of errors based on the findings of research on only one target language and at only one stage of learning. The hierarchies that were established confirm the error dependency on three major factors: the mother-tongue, the target language and the input. Mother-tongue interference was found to be high in German but low in Spanish. Thus, the incidence of mother-tongue interference appears to be influenced by an interaction of L1 and L2. Upon looking at the results obtained for German, the claim that mother-tongue interference is minimal in L2 acquisition seems unwarranted. On the other hand, the results obtained for Spanish would confirm such a claim. However, even in Spanish, it would be invalidated by sample 4; which indicates the importance of taking the stage of learning into account.

Mother-tongue interference is usually thought of as the application of a mother-tongue rule in the target language. The findings of this study indicate further influence of the native language in the reinforcement of certain cases of simplification. The incidence of these errors equally varies from language to language as errors depend on the simplicity or complexity of a particular target language structure as related to

the mother-tongue. These cases of simplification were labelled dual errors. They were found to be frequent in Spanish, but infrequent in German. The opportunity to commit the error may have been a factor in the frequency differences; however, differences between the target languages appeared to have played an important role in their production. Spanish errors occurred in structures which were more complex than the corresponding English ones. The German structures in these particular cases were parallel to the English ones. George (1972) has remarked on the learner's preference for the simpler system. Although the mother-tongue is not the only cause of interference in these errors (simplification is a common strategy in second language acquisition), its influence cannot be discarded as non-existent.

These findings seem to provide an explanation for discrepancies in second language research and for varying conclusions that have been reached by different researchers. Advocates of contrastive analysis maintain that the mother-tongue is a major source of interference. On the other hand, Dulay and Burt (in Tarone 1974) discount mother-tongue interference as a process in L2 acquisition because they found "strong evidence" against interference of this type. They report that in their study only 4.7% of 513 syntactic errors unambiguously reflected native language syntax. Dulay and Burt's subjects were Chinese and Spanish speaking children learning English. Cohen (1974) who studied children of approximately the same age as those in Dulay and Burt's study but who were English speakers learning Spanish, reports errors similar to those found in this study. His subjects had difficulty with gender of articles and adjectives. There was an overuse of masculine indefinite

articles and of masculine adjectives. The gender marker appears redundant to the learner and the predominant use of only one gender is an attempt at simplifying the grammar. Since English does not have gender marking in either articles or adjectives, one cannot state with certainty that English did not influence the simplification.

A high incidence of interlingual errors was also found by Powell (1975). Her subjects were English speaking high school students learning French. Errors involve primarily word order, as did the German interlingual errors in this investigation. Word order errors of this type are not exclusive to older learners. The investigator's children are English-German bilinguals, English being their dominant language. Between the ages of six to seven years, when exposure to English was increased through the school system, English interference in the German word order was very frequent. However, German did not appear to influence the English word order, just as Spanish and Chinese do not appear to influence the English word order in Dulay and Burt's studies.

Further evidence used by Dulay and Burt for discounting mother-tongue interference is the absence of positive transfer. A special category was provided in this study for such a type of error (lack of transfer errors). Their infrequency also varied from target language to target language and in Spanish from sample to sample. This indicates once more that the frequency of this type of error when obtained from the study of one target language, and at one stage of learning, does not warrant the conclusion that its infrequency is evidence for minimal mother-tongue interference in L2 acquisition.

APPENDIX

Examples of errors

Spanish

Provided form	Correct form
Intralingual	
tiene (he has)	tengo (I have)
quiero (I want)	quiere (he wants)
estoy (I am)	soy (I am)
venieron	vinieron (they came)
hacido (irregular participle regularized)	hecho
el niño bonita (no adjective agreement)	el niño bonito
Buenos tardes " " "	Buenas tardes
Va en la escuela (wrong preposition)	Va a la escuela
Piensa de comida " "	Piensa en comida
Interlingual	
Me llamo es (my name 's)	Me llamo
attiendo (I attend)	asisto
expecta (he expects)	espera
un otro día (another day)	otro día
una familia larga (a large family)	una familia grande
excepto por Rolando (except for Roland)	excepto Rolando
con no (without)	sin
Lack of transfer	
Yo estudiante (I am a student)	Yo soy estudiante
Necesito voy a la clase (I need I go to class)	Necesito ir a la clase

Examples of errors cont'd.

Spanish

Provided form	Correct form
Yo vuelvo a universidad (I return to university	Yo vuelvo a la universidad
él vivido (he lived)	él ha vivido (he has lived)
Communicative (before form was taught)	
Me gusto leer (I please myself to read)	Me gusta leer
estoy entiendo (I am I understand)	Estoy entendiendo (I am understanding)
mirariendo (wrong word form)	miraremos (we will look)
años simpáticos (friendly years)	años agradables (pleasant years)
Vino para mí (he came for me)	vino por mí
sobre de	acerca de (about)
Overlap	
Despues de comemos (after (that) we eat)	despues de comer
Hay estar (there is to be)	Hay (there is)
Mi familia tienen (my family have)	Mi familia tiene (my family has)
grande (big)	gran (great)
muy (very)	muchos (many)
Queremos a ir (overgeneralization of use of a/ equation with English to)	Queremos ir
Whole expression errors (interlingual)	
Tuvimos un buen tiempo (we had a good time)	Nos divertimos
Soy tarde (I am late)	Se me hizo tarde
Dijo por tu venir aquí (He said for you to come here)	Dijo que vinieras aquí

Examples of errors cont'd.

German

Provided form	Correct form
Intralingual	
Ich heisst (I he is called)	Ich heisse (I am called)
Es hat gewesen	Es ist gewesen
Er spracht (present and past tense combination)	Er sprach (he spoke)
viele Geld (no adjective agreement)	viel Geld
Die Zug " " "	der Zug
Am acht Uhr (wrong preposition)	um acht Uhr (at eight o'clock)
Wir hat (we he has)	wir haben (we have)
Interlingual	
Er war recht (he was right)	Er hatte recht
Bist Du Angst? (are you fear?)	Hast Du Angst? (are you afraid?)
Ich bleibe in Santa Clara (I stay in Santa Clara)	Ich wohne in . . . (I live in)
Es gehörte zu meinem Vater (It belonged to my father)	Es gehörte meinem Vater
Wir wohnen hier für acht Jahre (We live here for eight years)	Wir wohnen hier act Jahre (lang)
Lack of transfer	
Ich will lerne (I want I learn)	Ich will lernen (I want to learn)
Er mein Freund (He my friend)	Er ist mein Freund (He is my friend)

Examples of errors cont'd.

German

Provided form	Correct form
Meine Mutter arbeitet an Universität (My mother works at un versity)	Meine Mutter arbeitet an der Universität
Kommst Du mir? (Do you come me?)	Kommst Du mit mir? (Do you come with me?)
Ich gehe die Klasse (I go the class)	Ich gehe in die Klasse (I go in the class)
Communicative (before form was taught)	
brauchen (to need)	bringen (to bring)
mitnehmen (to take with...)	mitgehen (to go with...)
lassen (to leave)	verlassen (to abandon)
Ich bin studiere (I am I study)	Ich studiere (I study/I am studying)
Overlap	
arbeiten (present tense) to work	arbeiteten (past tense)
Er war liegen (He was lying) war incorrect in this sentence	Er blieb liegen (he remained lying)
An Sonntags (influence of am Sonntag, and on Sundays)	Sonntags
Word order errors	
Intralingual	
Ich kann nicht ihm glauben	Ich kann ihm nicht glauben
Er auch Sonntags arbeitet	Er arbeitet auch Sonntags
Interlingual	
Hoffentlich Du bist gesund	Hoffentlich bist Du gesund
Morgen ich gehe...	Morgen gehe ich...

Examples of errors cont'd.

German

Provided form	Correct form
Ich bin glücklich sein hier	Ich bin glücklich hier zu sein

Lack of transfer

Ich bin krank nicht (I am sick not)	Ich bin nicht krank
Aber habe ich kein Geld (But have I no money)	Aber ich habe kein Geld
Wir in ein Haus wohnen (We in a house live)	Wir wohnen in einem Haus

Whole expression errors (interlingual)

Er dankt mir für nehmen und abholen ihn. (He thanks me for taking and picking him up.)	Er dankt mir dass ich ihn hingefahren und abgeholt habe.
Das ist warum ich heisse Mary. (That is why I am called Mary,)	Deswegen heisse ich Mary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, N., Madden, C., and Krashen, S.D. Is there a "natural sequence" in adult language learning? Language Learning, 1974, 24, 235-243.

Bertkau, J. An analysis of English learner speech. Language Learning, 1974, 24, 279-286.

Buteau, M.F. Students' errors and the learning of French as a second language: A pilot study. IRAL, 1970, 5, 161-169.

Cancino, H., Rosansky, E., and Schumann, J. Testing hypothesis about second language acquisition: The copula and negative in three subjects. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974, 3, 80-96.

Cohen, A. The Culver City Spanish immersion program: How does summer recess affect Spanish speaking ability? Language Learning, 1974, 24, 55-68.

Corder, P. The significance of learners' errors. IRAL, 1967, 5, 161-169.

Corder, P. Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. IRAL, 1971, 9, 147-159.

Dulay, H., and Burt, M. Should we teach children syntax? Language Learning, 1973, 23, 245-258.

Dulay, H., and Burt, M. Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974a, 3, 44-67.

Dulay, H., and Burt, M. A new perspective on the creative construction processes in child second language acquisition. Language Learning, 1974b, 24, 253-278.

Dušcová, L. On sources of errors in foreign language learning. IRAL, 1969, 7, 11-33.

George, H. Common Errors in Language Learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.

Hatch, E. Second language learning universals? Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974, 3, 1-17.

Leisi, E. Theoretische Grundlagen der Fehlerbewertung. In G. Nickel, ed., Fehlerkunde. Berlin: Cornelsen-Velhagen und Klassing, 1972.

LoCoco, V.G. An Analysis of Errors in the Learning of Spanish and of German as Second Languages. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

Naiman, N. The use of elicited imitation in second language acquisition research. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974, 2, 1-37.

Nickel, G. Grundsätzliches zur Fehleranalyse und Fehlerbewertung. In G. Nickel, ed., Fehlerkunde, Berlin: Cornelsen-Velhagen und Klassing, 1972.

Politzer, R.L. and Ramirez, A. An error analysis of the spoken English of Mexican-American pupils in bilingual school and a monolingual school. Language Learning, 1973, 23, 39-61.

Powell, P. Moi Tarzan, vous Jane? A study of communicative competence. Foreign Language Annals, 1975, 8, 38-42.

Richards, J.C. A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. English Language Teaching, 1971b, 25, 204-229.

Richards, J.C. Error analysis and second language learning strategies. Language Learning, 1971a, 11, 12-22.

Scott, M., and Tucker, G.R. Error analysis and English-language strategies of Arab students. Language Learning, 1974, 24, 69-97.

Slobin, D. Developmental psycholinguistics. In W.O. Dingwall, ed., A Survey of Linguistic Science, University of Maryland, 1971.

Swain, M., Dumas, G., and Naiman, N. Alternatives to spontaneous speech: elicited translation and imitation as indicators of second language competence. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974, 3, 68-79.

Tarone, E. A discussion on the Dulay and Burt studies. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974a, 4, 57-70.

Tarone, E. Speech preparation in second language acquisition: a suggested model. Language Learning, 1974b, 24, 223-232.